UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

The Woman's Crusade Against War Is Here—Join In!

By SYDNEY STRONG

A Women's Conference for Peace

By REIGH UTLEY

An Open Letter to Norman Thomas

By I. A. HUSICK

Mahatma Gandhi's National College

By BHARATAN KUMARAPPA

VOLUME CIX NUMBER 16

Chicago, June 20, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN — CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN, FRED HANKINSON, REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL, ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 243
The Woman's Crusade Against War Is Here—Join In—SYDNEY STRONG 245
Jottings—J. H. H 247

ARTICLES—
The Means Towards Genuine Peace—*Nietzsche* 243
A Women's Conference for Peace—REIGH UTLEY 248
An Open Letter to Norman Thomas—I. A. HUSICK, M.D. 249
Mahatma Gandhi's National College; The Gujarat Vidyapith—BHARATAN KUMARAPPA 252

POETRY—
The Torch—LOUIS I. NEWMAN 253
Roman Memories—Tivoli—LILLIAN BROWNE-OLF 253
The Truth Promethean—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 253
You're Fired—MELVILLE KRESS 253

THE STUDY TABLE—
Did Jesus Make Mistakes?—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 254

CORRESPONDENCE—
An Answer to Mrs. Auxter—WALTER J. MILLARD 255
In Praise of Dr. Strong—EMMA A. CYRUS 255

THE FIELD—
The Ballyhoo for Booze—*The American Friend* 242

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Ballyhoo for Booze

Week after week, month after month, the ballyhoo goes on, increasing in frenzy. Rarely, if ever, has there been so general and defiant a conspiracy to break down the constitutional forms of government—and never a conspiracy for a worse cause. The conspirators include, first, in the "upper brackets," those "liberals" who contend they are opposing tyranny and defending the sacred principle of individual rights; second, a powerful group of financial interests which wish to escape their income taxes by having the government take its revenue from the beer drinkers; third, the people with a bad thirst which they wish to satisfy more easily and at less cost. Backed by the metropolitan press, largely controlled by the above-mentioned interests, these elements constitute a serious threat against law and decency. That many opponents of prohibition are honest and high-minded, we would not deny. So far as the general attack is concerned, however, it is willful and malicious. Day by day, the wet newspapers fairly reek with misrepresentation and falsehood in opposing prohibition and in holding its supporters up to ridicule. Such an orgy of mendacity, such a clamor of bluster, the country has never known.

As their major strokes of strategy, the wets are making three terrific drives. The object of the first one is to demonstrate that prohibition is not being enforced and cannot be. Their method of demonstration can scarcely be designated as less than diabolical. On the one hand, through the press, the radio, and the movies, they have poured a daily stream of propaganda encouraging people to break the law. They patronize the bootlegger, hold the Eighteenth Amendment up to scorn, and deride and denounce enforcement officials. "See," they declare, on the other hand, "how impossible it is to enforce the law!"

The second objective is to fix the responsibility upon prohibition for the high tide of lawlessness and crime which is sweeping over the country. Having done everything possible to breed disrespect for law in one direction, the wets feign to abhor such disrespect in other directions. Crying out against the very lawlessness they have fomented, they lay the blame on prohibition. The fact that official figures from our penal institutions show that a small percent of inmates have been sent up for violation of the prohibition laws, seems to cramp their style not at all. What are facts between foes of tyranny and friends of "likker"? On with the ballyhoo! Incredible as it seems, the fanatical wets have stooped so low as to try to capitalize the Lindbergh tragedy by laying it on the doorstep of prohibition! This would certainly appear to be the very last word in utter distortion of

(*Continued on page 255*)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CIX MONDAY, JUNE 20, 1932 Number 16

THE MEANS TOWARD GENUINE PEACE

No government will now-a-days admit that it maintains an army in order to satisfy occasionally its passion for conquest. The army is said to serve only defensive purposes. This morality, which justifies self-defense, is called in as the government's advocate. This means, however, reserving morality for ourselves and immorality for our neighbors, because he must be thought eager for attack and conquest if our state is forced to consider means of self-defense. At the same time by our explanation of our need of an army (because he denies the lust of attack just as our state does, and ostensibly also maintains his army for defensive reasons), we proclaim him a hypocrite and cunning criminal, who would fain seize by surprise, without any fighting, a harmless and unwary victim. In this attitude all states face each other today. They presuppose evil intentions on their neighbor's part and good intentions on their own. This hypothesis, however, is an inhuman notion, as bad as and worse than war. Nay, at bottom it is a challenge and motive to war, foisting as it does upon the neighboring state the charge of immorality, and thus provoking hostile intentions and acts. The doctrine of the army as a means of self-defense must be abjured as completely as the lust of conquest. Perhaps a memorable day will come when a nation renowned in wars and victories, distinguished by the highest development of military order and intelligence, and accustomed to make the heaviest sacrifice to these objects, will voluntarily exclaim, "We will break our swords," and will destroy its whole military system, lock, stock, and barrel. Making ourselves defenseless (after having been the most strongly defended) from a loftiness of sentiment—that is the means towards genuine peace, which must always rest upon a pacific disposition! The so-called armed peace that prevails at present in all countries is a sign of a bellicose disposition, of a disposition that trusts neither itself nor its neighbor, and, partly from hate, partly from fear, refuses to lay down its weapons. Better to perish than to hate and fear, and twice as far better to perish than to make oneself hated and feared —this must some day become the supreme maxim of every political community! Our liberal representatives of the people, as is well known, have not the time for reflection on the nature of humanity, or else they would know that they are working in vain when they work for a "gradual diminution of the military burdens." On the contrary, when the distress of these burdens is greatest, the sort of God who alone can help here will be nearest. The tree of military glory can only be destroyed at one swoop, with one stroke of lightning. But, as we know, lightning comes from the cloud and from above.

—*Nietzsche:* "Human All Too Human."

It has been amusing, and likewise pathetic, to see the American newspapers play down the startling news from Germany of Bruening's overthrow. This was altogether the most fateful news of the year—one more long slide into the abyss which yawns before all Europe! But our press gave it inconspicuous headlines, and accompanied it with platitudinous editorials. This was an attempt, of course, to cover up the utter shame of American journalism in its recent interpretation of events in the Reich. The election of Hindenburg, for example, was hailed by our papers as a great victory for the republic, and the beginning of the end of Hitler. The Prussian elections, a harder pill to swallow, was coated all over with the sugar of ecstatic announcements that the Hitlerites had failed to reach their goal of a majority in the Diet. As a matter of fact, of course—as special correspondents in Berlin were pointing out—both of these elections were a smashing triumph for the "Nazis." The republic was not saved at all, but on the contrary was sweeping swiftly and surely toward collapse. Now, within a few weeks, the National Socialists (Hitlerites) have taken control of Prussia, and Chancellor Bruening and his Cabinet have tumbled into the dust. What wonder that the "Nazis" are shouting that their day has come! What Hindenburg has now done is to make one more desperate attempt to stave off the inevitable. Bruening, a great man and a sincere statesman, whatever his mistakes, had been completely discredited by the outcome of the presidential elections. American editors did not know this, but Hindenburg *did*. There was nothing to do, if the republic was to be saved, but to get rid of the existing government, and turn to the strong arm of the militarists and political reactionaries. That this will avail anything in the end, is of course impossible. The old Field Marshal knows this as well as anybody. But it at least postpones matters—gives a brief breathing-spell—and in this interim anything may happen.

The real lesson of the German tragedy runs far deeper than anything involved in the political maneuvers of Social Democrats, National Socialists, and Centrists. What we have here, at bottom, is another perfect illustration of the futility of force. For when Hitler was suddenly transformed from a local demagogue into a national leader, a definite line of policy was deliberately adopted by Hindenburg in defense of the republic. This policy, curiously enough, was to abandon the republic in the face of its enemies, and have resort to force. The Weimar constitution, in other words, strangely provided with the means of its own

destruction, was suspended by presidential fiat, and the government conducted on the basis of edicts. For a full year, now, Germany has been run from Berlin exactly as Italy is run from Rome—by the arbitrary will of its self-chosen executive. This means, of course, the substitution of autocracy for democracy—the displacement of law by violence. During all this period, the Reichstag has counted not at all. Nor has the people's will! Whatever the government has thought it prudent or wise to do, it has done, with no authority save that of the sheer military power under its control. As time has gone on, Bruening and his associates, more and more hard-pressed, have resorted to more and desperate measures of defense. In the recent elections, every device of arbitrary repression and tyranny was practiced. The headquarters of opponents were raided, their papers seized, their organizations disbanded, their meetings scattered. With the result that the "Nazis" increased in numbers and enthusiasm with a swiftness that was breath-taking, and has at last overborne the government! Now comes one last campaign for terrorism, with the end already in sight. Force, in other words, has failed once more. Threatened from without, it has destroyed Germany the more swiftly from within. Bruening has simply prepared the way for Hitler. What irony—and tragedy!

Well, the budget has been balanced, or will be balanced—and what of it? Nothing at all, so far as we can see, except that we shall all be paying more for taxes and less for food, clothing and shelter from now on, and thus deepening the depression to new low levels. For we are of those who are so simple-minded that we cannot understand how the people are helped to climb out of the pit of misery, into which they have fallen, by putting new and heavier burdens upon their backs. We are inclined to agree with William E. Woodward in his book, "Money for Tomorrow," when he argues that it is in times of prosperity that the taxes should be increased and the state and national debts paid off, and in times of depression that the taxes should be lifted. Certainly this sounds sensible—so sensible that we are tempted to believe that this cry, "Balance the budget," is the biggest piece of "bunk" ever put over on a frightened people by a frightened government. But at bottom it makes little difference, perhaps, what this country does or does not do in the matter of trying to catch that elusive ghost, Prosperity, which is ever lurking around the corner. What we need ever to remember is the fact that the present stagnation of business, unlike any other stagnation which has preceded it, is not a local but a world-wide affair. The causes of America's ills run out to the farthest bounds of earth. They are rooted in the chaos of Asia, the confusion of Europe, the collapse of South America and the islands of the sea. We are suffering only as Newfoundland, Brazil, Roumania, New Zealand, Japan, and Hawaii are suffering—in the same way, and for the same reason. Our whole great system of organized life is sick unto death. As well expect to abate the fever in an arm, by some kind of special treatment, when all the body is aflame, as to save America while Europe or Australia goes to ruin. No, civilization is at stake—and we sink or swim together!

The "bonus" marches of the war veterans have a significance far transcending anything that happened, or may happen, in Washington, and altogether apart from the rather ludicrous events in the nation's capital. As a gesture of agitation for legislation, the demonstrations were by turns amusing, pitiful, and irritating. The deliberate exploitation of war sentiment, and the utterly crass and crude selfishness of the veterans' demand for special favor, were of course disgusting. As for the protests and alarms of the "higher-ups" in the veterans' organizations—the Legion's officers, and the rest—we may be pardoned, perhaps, for asking what these men expected, and why they should be surprised and angry. For what have the leaders of the veterans been doing in recent years but teaching their followers that the government was theirs to plunder at their will? Having aroused the hunger of the Legion, they must themselves be held responsible if the rougher element among them resort to unconventional methods of satisfying this hunger. But the real significance of this episode lies in quite another direction. What we see in it is a portent, or even threat, of what is likely to take place this coming winter when government relief breaks down and millions of Americans stand face to face with starvation. Not veterans with a selfish demand for a "bonus," but citizens with an elemental right to live, will then begin to march. For anybody who has any idea that the people of this country are going to remain forever quiet as their misery grows deeper and deeper, is cherishing a strange delusion. Americans are a patient lot, especially the poor among them. This last winter bears eloquent testimony to this fact! But Americans are also a lawless people, prone to mass action, and, once aroused, move like flame before the wind. We advise the government to ponder matters this summer, and weigh the wisdom of feeding men before rather than after an uprising.

In the Atlanta *Independent* (May 6, 1932), there appeared the following:

Twelve Year Old Girl Is Assaulted by White Man in Alabama

Little Murdis Dixon, a Negro school girl, small for her age and weighing about 75 pounds, was decoyed by a white man into an unpopulated, wooded section of Birmingham about

four o'clock in the afternoon of April 26th. The white man was well dressed and called at the home of the girl upon the pretext that he wanted to employ a girl to stay home and take care of his mother and four-year-old daughter for the evening. Murdis' mother was sick and she herself had just come home from school.

She went with the white man to earn the much-needed pennies which he offered to pay. When they reached the woods, he attacked her, throwing her to the ground. When she screamed he threatened he would kill her with an open knife which he drew.

She returned home some time later in a semi-conscious condition. Her clothes were bloody and torn. Her father took her to a doctor where he found her condition so serious that she was rushed to a hospital for treatment. The police were notified, but nothing has been done, not even mention was made in the local news. . . .

The girl's father wanted to go out to the newspapers, but was advised by Negro preachers and misleaders to hush it up on the pretext that it would be harder to catch the white man. The poor father, helpless under the oppressive conditions, did not know what to do. The International Labor Defense is investigating this case. . . .

This story, which we assume to be true—it sounds so natural!—stirs various echoes in our mind. Thus, there is the echo of the Scottsboro case, of the Massie case. This story also excites certain questions. Why, for example, was there no mob uprising against this white ravisher in Birmingham, as there was in Scottsboro against the Negro boys who were "framed" on the flimsy charge which has brought them to the threshold of the death-house. Again, suppose this Negro father, outraged by the sight of his injured child, as Lieut. Massie was outraged by the sight of his injured wife, had enticed the rapist into his home and killed him in vengeance for his deed. Would public opinion have arisen up in sympathy, and would senators and representatives have lifted a chorus of approval? If tried and convicted for such an act, would this Negro father have been released by the Governor, after an hour's confinement, amid the applause of multitudes? Circumstances alter cases. So do persons! "God is no respecter of persons," but American justice *is*. A white man can do all kinds of things to a black or brown man, but let the colored man try to do these things! Well, it seems to make a difference.

We are interested in the idea of a "Free Church of America," as proposed by the Unitarians and Universalists. In its inception this idea is a scheme for uniting these two liberal bodies into one communion. For years the Unitarians and Universalists have been talking about getting together, but have been doing little about it. This failure to act is a good deal of a scandal, for the two religious groups represent historically the same spiritual reaction against Orthodoxy, their constituencies are friendly and cooperative, and their practical purposes much the same. But the traditional trouble which besets mergers of this kind—the fear of each that it will be swallowed up by the other—has been again at work, and much faithful labor has therefore come to nothing. Now some genius has suggested this idea of a "Free Church of America," which means, we take it, a sort of holding company for the two denominations, which will thus unite but still maintain their separate identities. But this statesmanlike proposal has significance far beyond the borders of Unitarianism and Universalism! A genuine "Free Church," organized along nation-wide lines, would attract other bodies. The Community Church movement would certainly join—or failing the possibility of action by this loosely federated group, many individual community churches would do so. The Congregationalists could not long remain outside, for their freedom is a boasted heritage. The Friends, likewise, would have to come in. We do not believe that the Ethical Culturists would decline an offer of fellowship. Surely, there is the promise here of a great communion of free churches and free souls, which may well unite the liberal religionists of the entire country. We do not wonder that the American Unitarian Association, at its recent annual meeting, hailed "the birth of the Free Church of America with the devout hope that it may lead to the early and effective union of the forces of liberal religion."

The Woman's Crusade Against War Is Here—Join In!*

We are led to tell a story in the campaign against war of the formation of the World Peace Movement of Women, which may prove an effective Crusade.

Chapter One

On May 8th we sent from Geneva an editorial for UNITY. In this letter we discussed *Time for a Woman's Crusade*. We intimated that the spell that covered the world could not be broken except by a woman's attack. We mentioned the part that women had played in "starting things." We had observed that the men in the Disarmament Conference acted like frozen beings. Woman might break through all social restraint and secure world-peace for the race. We gave examples of women who had started things going. We asked, Who would start such a world-wide Crusade, with a resolution to abolish arms, regardless of consequences? It might mean praying bands kneeling around the enlisting boards or in front of the war offices. It might mean strikes by students and workers for the total abolition of war machines. It might mean storming the Secretariat of the League of Nations. The people must be aroused! Small groups must grow to bands, to companies, to a mighty throng of people determined to "know one thing," namely, the complete abolition of arms!

Women like some we know, highly intelligent and

*See editorial by Dr. Strong in the June 6th issue of UNITY, page 213. These editorials are written from Geneva, where Dr. Strong is serving as our Special Correspondent.—Editor.

unpurchasable, once under way, would be invincible.

"May the unconquerable, crusading spirit of Mary Lyon, Lucy Stone and Lucretia Mott fall upon the youth of today. May things begin to happen!"

Chapter Two

On May 10th "things began to happen." We had a letter from Martha Provine-Leach Turner, of Berlin. Among other things, she said:

"This is just to let you know that the women are coming. I had been feeling for a long time that the women ought to do something and your letter struck the match. I have a pledge and plans for six months outlined since yesterday. To-day I am getting it all in order and typed and ready to begin work. Tomorrow we shall launch our campaign. I shall have the pledge and suggestions and already have a long list of women to whom they will be sent. . . . I would rather sit quietly by and write poetry, but something has to be done."

On May 14th Mrs. Turner wrote:

"I am enclosing the pledge, the letter and the plans. . . . I do not expect everyone to fall hard for this because we are not being 'diplomatic and gentle.' But I do think there are enough women in the world with real ideals to make this thing a matter that will count heavily with statesmen before long."

On May 23rd she wrote:

"So that is settled. We are then the *World Peace Movement of Women.* We can start out with an absolutely clean slate. We are going to do as we choose. We have no ties to tradition. . . . I am glad to hear of the forward-looking French women. I had expected to hear the opposite. We shall get something going among them in a little while. I think now we can start in earnest to put the thing up to women."

Chapter Three

A Personal Letter—sent out by Mrs. Turner:

"I address this letter to you personally because this movement is to be a personal movement. I have just witnessed the utter failure—at least it seemed utter to one with any idealism—of a fine and progressive women's organization to do anything definite with regard to peace. . . . Too long the organizations of the world, including the governments of nations, have failed to accomplish anything really noteworthy on the question of peace. Let us rather say, disarmament. Christianity spread because one person told another. Most religions are propagated that way. I am telling you who read this letter very personally what I hope you will help us to do. And I want you to tell your friends and neighbors in as personal way.

"As I have already said, the governments seem to be getting nowhere fast on the disarmament problem. A recent observer at Geneva sent out a call to the women of the world saying that man was done. He will probably be unable to do much for a long time. But women, said this man—for it was a man—are unafraid to try new things, they are freer from old prejudices, and most of all they have had that happy facility for accomplishing things while the men are still discussing the possibilities. So the women are moving and they are going to move with decision and with all the speed that they can muster.

"We feel that all women over the entire world realize that war is bad. How deeply they realize this and if they know really how bad it is is the question. Those of us who do not live in the storm-centers of the world perhaps are not so conscious of the ever-darkening clouds on the horizon. It is now fourteen years since the last war. It has never really stopped. The war was concluded by the most wretchedly unjust treaty of the world's history, and since that time a continual battle has been waged in Europe with the former enemies still enemies in a quieter, physically less dangerous, but more deadly warfare than before. Now with feelings of hate and revenge still seething, new storms loom up which promise that if something desperate is not done in the course of a few months, the world will be plunged into such chaos and such destruction as has never been witnessed before. Another war is impossible because of the advancement of chemical methods. It seems positively insane for anyone to talk of another war when we know it will mean wholesale wiping out not only of armies but of civilian populations. Who wants to die? But it will mean death to whole nations and perhaps the world. This is candidly admitted by all, yet at a conference to limit armaments delegates calmly say that they cannot give up their right to protection. Who will be protected?

"There is much said nowadays about *sane* and sensible peace-movements. With many of my self-respecting friends it seems to be a matter of pride that a number of peace movements are not coming out wildly demanding total disarmament but are simply preaching a pleasant little gospel of loving each other. In a modern world it seems to me that the *only sane people* are those who say there simply cannot be any more wars. To say another war must come is total insanity or else the suppressed desire for extinction. I have no such suppressed desire. I am not a pacifist from principle so much as I am from fear. I am scared and badly scared of another war. I would go across long oceans to escape it. I shall never send my husband to one. Back of all this is the firm conviction that war is simply a wholesale method of killing our fellow beings. I cannot see how I, desiring to live, have any right to kill another person.

"These are some of the main reasons for our starting this movement. Peace must come at almost any price. No, let us not even put in so small a modifier. Peace must come at any price. The world still holds miracles when we wish for them hard enough. Women desperately demanding and working for peace will work a miracle—there is no doubt about it. But let us make this one point clear. We call this the World Peace Movement. It is so-called because in the end the word peace seems to have a larger connotation than other words that might be used. No purely negative word seems large enough. But often in the very largeness of the meaning it holds also a pitiful vagueness. Everyone in the world wants peace, but a great number of people do not want disarmament. We talk a lot about peace but when we are slapped we want to slap back. Peace has been too long a wishy-washy affair that was pleasant to think about and make speeches about on Armistice Day. Many organizations today are "crying peace, peace," and there is no peace. Therefore we stand for definite method for bringing peace. We want our conception of peace to be the strong, forceful, active one of the Beatitudes. As this is written by a woman who is trying to be a Christian it cannot help but embody to a large degree the teaching and the ideals of Jesus. We hope that women of all religions will unite with us, but we know that in this they can, for the teachings of Jesus are not at odds with other religions, especially on this point, but are one with them. We want to be peacemakers in the name of God, and a better world.

"Read the Pledge (below) carefully. If you do not feel that you can give yourself whole-heartedly to trying to live up to it—we do not ask for immediate perfection—do not sign it yet. You will come to sign it some day I am sure. We want, however, only those who are deadly in earnest. I wish I could set all on fire. We do not wish to be fanatics in the bad sense. We do not wish to make much noise and do nothing. But we do wish to be radicals in the finest sense of the word. We believe in the intellect, in the moral conscience, and in the emotions. We include them all in our work. We suggest that the women who join us take up the suggestion that has often been made that peace must be made as attractive emotionally as war is.

MARTHA PROVINE-LEACH TURNER,

Motzstrasse 6—Berlin, Germany."

Chapter Four

Pledge—World Peace Movement of Women

"We join this movement believing that peace must come in the world, and that it must come now. We have seen our men slaughtered enough. We stand unreservedly for:

"Total Disarmament of all nations, especially our own, whatever it may be, at the present time and in spite of all so-called insurmountable obstacles.

"We pledge ourselves individually and collectively as personal missionaries for peace, which means:

"(1) Through personal work, obtaining at least ten new members.

"(2) Working in every organization to which we belong that each organization may stand firmly against war, and for total disarmament now;

"(3) Winning new friends and members constantly;

"(4) Teaching our children that war is always wrong,

and rearing them to be courageous enough to refuse to participate in any war;

"(5) Practicing non-violence (non-resistance) in every phase of life to our utmost ability, and holding ourselves ready to stop war should it arise;

"(6) Standing together to demand peace and total disarmament from our statesmen, and working for peace in all our thoughts, words and deeds, to the point of sacrifice.

"This is our Crusade!"

Chapter Five

Outline of Plans for the Peace Movement.

"Pledges and letters sent out to important women over the world.

"Pledges and letters sent to personal friends by all who are interested.

"Each letter to include several forms for signatures so that they can be passed on.

"Signatures sent in to headquarters often.

"Every woman to secure several names each month. In larger places each week.

"The women who have signed would profit by having a meeting for a general discussion of plans of work. After that meetings may be called whenever it seems that something needs to be discussed or done.

"Practical things that can be undertaken are:

"(1) Ask Librarian to set aside a shelf in library for peace. A list of suitable books will be sent out very soon.

"(2) Suggest studies in peace work or in current events emphasizing peace in the Woman's Club, in Church societies, or any other organizations to which you belong.

"(3) Secure any good speaker you possibly can and hold mass meetings. We shall send speaker to you as soon as possible.

"(4) Ask the ministers in town to preach fairly regularly on disarmament and peace. Have union services with special programs.

"(5) Use the programs sent out to you in any meetings you can whether large or small.

"(6) If you have any contact with young people interest them as much as you can. Most of the young people have little idea of the horror of war.

"(7) Urge attendance at anti-war pictures. We cannot say with the weak sisters, 'Oh, I've seen enough war pictures.' All of us have, but we need lots more.

"(8) If you have a dramatic club of any kind urge them to try one of the recommended plays. Or use one of the pageants in some church.

"(9) Form small prayer groups meeting at least once a week and oftener if possible to pray earnestly for peace.

"(10) If you have no summer program for your children start a story hour with stress on peace. Or see if it is possible to use the playground or story-hour already going for such purpose. Close the summer with a peace parade in which the children make their own banners and floats.

"(11) Use all patriotic holidays for some vivid and attractive peace demonstration. Try to keep peace continually before the public eye.

"(12) If you are in the seat of a part of state or federal government try picketing with peace banners. Insistent demands often win you know.

"(13) Never let the idea die out. Use your own and everyone's ingenuity. Keep in touch with the movement outside of your own town.

"(14) Start a peace scrap-book containing poetry and articles on peace. Information and propaganda for and against disarmament.

"(15) Never forget that we are in for big things."

Chapter Six

"We Must Look to the Women"—so says Dr. Harry A. Overstreet, Department of Philosophy and Psychology, of the College of the City of New York, in a letter dated May 20th, as follows:

"My dear Mr. Strong:

"Thank you for sending me letter on, 'Time for a Woman's Crusade.' I think you have hit upon a great idea. I myself believe that the major humanizing movements are in a large measure to be initiated and carried out by women. That is now their function and privilege, and I myself hope that before long some of the great women of the world will undertake such a leadership as you suggest and enlist their sisters and the rest of us in this crusade. I myself have little faith in men leaders. Men are conservatives who follow the accepted social codes and patterns. We must look to the women."

Chapter Seven

Dr. Overstreet will be gratified to know that his prophecy was fulfilled on the same day that he was writing, May 20th, when Martha Provine-Leach Turner wrote: "It is settled. We are then the *World Peace Movement of Women.*" All women in all parts of the world are heartily invited to join in. The address is Motzstrasse, 6. Berlin.

The hour has struck. The efforts at Geneva have come to a deadlock. The Navy Commission has agreed that it is possible to abolish floating bombs! There is an imperative demand for the adoption of total disarmament. Who can have "faith in men leaders"? This is a divine deadlock. Now is God's opportunity, and time for a Woman's Crusade! With God all things are possible. We are for it.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Jottings

Sydney Strong writes us from Geneva that "Gandhi's prison bars are a universal radio." The old, old truth, stated by a modern prophet in modern phrase! We respectfully commend it to the British government.

Thousands of men in this country break the law for a glass of beer—and do so with the applause of thousands of their fellow-citizens. If for a glass of beer, why not for a loaf of bread? And if thousands break the law next winter to this end, will other thousands applaud?

As we look out of our study window, on the coast of Maine, we see a citizen of the community out on the flats digging clams for his evening meal. What would happen to this same citizen if he should attempt to dig dandelion greens or pick apples in his neighbor's pasture for this same evening meal? Why does the ocean belong to everybody—and the land only to those who can seize and hold it?

First prize for incisive humor on matters pertaining to the depression, we herewith unanimously award to the Nova Scotia *Register* which declares, "after exhaustive study of the subject, that there is no truth in the rumor of an impending ten per cent reduction in the wages of sin."

The *Christian Register* places us in its debt by

quoting the following as printed in the Boston *Transcript:*

Our small granddaughter returns from her modern pre-nursery school to announce that she had been "snooting" the flag. Her formula runs: "I pledge allegiance to my flag and to the public that it stands on: one nation invisible, with liberty and justice far off."

Russia had her Lenin, Chile her Davila, and the United States . . . may profit from their example. "If this be treason, make the most of it."

J. H. H.

A Women's Conference for Peace

[Special Correspondence]

While the world machinery at Geneva is marking time and the scouts of the press making frantic efforts to pry loose a scrap of story they can translate into news, here in Grenoble are stories going to waste.

Women from twenty-six countries are here met in the Seventh International Congress of the Women's International League for Peace.

Earnest women these, keen on every phase of a question so wrought with tragic tenseness they can almost hear again the roll of drums and marching feet of husbands and sons into the maw of war.

They are not smiling women. They have tragic eyes and a hush of horror in their voices as they sense the awfulness of another world war in the Sino-Japanese situation. They repeat "World Disarmament or World Disaster." It is not a slogan, it is a prophecy. Which will the world choose?

They must hurry. Already a generation has come since the war. Many of these delegates are from countries desolated by enemy armies, meeting here with no enmity in their hearts except enmity for war.

These women realize there is no safety in treaties if there is no will to keep them. "World Disarmament or World Disaster" and the world now bankrupt because of preparation for the next war.

"War is dramatic," said Dr. Mary Woolley, who came down from Geneva for the first day's session. "We peace people must learn to make an appeal to the imagination of humanity as the military does, and those of us who believe in treaties must recognize that it is not easy to find a common denominator, with all the differences of viewpoints of different nations." Dr. Woolley said the press should be a powerful influence for peace but instead it "stresses the difficulties between nations and not the accord."

I speak English only and sit through hours of translation as each speech is translated twice before it is open for discussion. I am fascinated as I watch these versatile women. They are self effaced in the earnestness of their message and vibrant with an intense restraint. Only once did I see this restraint lessened when a difference in the technique for peace had developed and Madame Gabrielle Duchene turned toward the English section with an impulsive gesture and said in substance: "We French are terribly in earnest. We are pacifists. We do not believe in force nor put our trust in treaties nor half-way measures. You people from the cold countries come so slowly. It is hard for French women to understand your impassivity."

Mme. Duchene is President of the Women's International League in France. A beautiful woman, no longer young, small in stature, graceful in movement. Her dark penetrating eyes meet yours as she speaks her message with a gravity that carries to your heart a great fear of the present menace in the orient. Peace she is sure can come only through disarmament. There is no half-way step.

A woman of great charm, of wealth and position, Mme. Duchene's Paris house before the war was a center of a coterie of intellectuals, *"une grande salon,"* where world notables were honored by their gracious hostess. Then came the war and she took her stand. Her friends deserted her; the press attacked her; her name was anathema in this war-mad nation. Undaunted she traveled through France, trying to hold the now meager peace sentiment to action. With war at its height she went to the Hague in 1915 hoping for a morsel of sanity in this seething insane world, and with other great women there formed the Women's International League for Peace.

They sent envoys to both belligerent and neutral countries of Europe and to the United States, hoping before war had involved all nations of the world, that governments would form a conference of neutrals to work for peace. These women had a well thought out plan; had it been accepted and put into practice by Governments it would have saved the world at large from three more years of human butchery and from the last seventeen years of increasingly widespread misery.

I watched Mme. Duchene last night as she addressed an audience at the Grenoble theatre, filled to the last seat even to the third balcony where men were standing. In this audience were army officers, former combatants, university professors, students, coatless workers and ordinary fathers, mothers and youths. As I took my seat I heard the burr of an alarm clock from the balcony and wondered if there would be a repetition of the pandemonium in Paris last fall at the Cecil Peace program when not a word could be heard because of whistles, shrills, bells and clanging noises, all by prearrangement of the military opposed to peace education. Was this a friendly or hostile audience? I felt reassured as I saw the Mayor of Grenoble in the front row on the stage.

Mme. Duchene stepped modestly forward after an introduction by a member of the Chamber of Deputies from the Grenoble District. My location gave me a view of nearly every seat in the theatre and as her speech progressed, I watched for signs of disapproval. She was given the most earnest attention and frequently interrupted with applause. She closed with an impassioned gesture and a cry of "disarm, France, disarm!" This sentiment brought a roar of applause, and I said to myself, "If this is the real France, then hope is not dead at Geneva."

Gertrude Baer, delegate from the (hated?) German nation, was given a veritable ovation. Her speech was punctuated with machine-gun applause and

especially her declaration that a "Franco-German rapprochement is the key to European peace and total disarmament the only real security against war."

There is another great woman of France. Indeed there are many, but I have only space to tell of this one, Camille Drevet. Erect, poised, calm, almost austere, she sits at the speakers' table and with appraising eyes measures each delegate. I felt her mentally labeling them "good, bad, indifferent," in the cause which she has made her life work. A head of heavy contour with close-cut hair, ruddy of face, firm compressed lips that are occasionally relaxed by an enigmatic Mona Lisa smile, this woman seems not made for the sunny side of life but to share the world's tragedies. And this she does, answering the call from these war-torn countries where minorities suffer inarticulate, and political prisoners languish without hope, and rampant militarism sets race against race. Fearlessly she has organized peace groups through Greece, Turkey, the seething Balkans and far China. "It is youth that must stop war," she said, and I thought of "Old men make wars and young men fight them," and again I thought of the youth procession in Lyons whose banners read, "We wish to live."

"Make peace dramatic," said Dr. Mary Woolley, and I recall Mme. Drevet's report of a Christmas pageant where each child representing a discordant nation brought a candle to the Christmas tree, but the tree would not light. Then the child of Peace came and placed her candle, the tree burst into light and the happy nations joined hands, drew together, and danced about the tree.

And is this Peace Congress in perfect accord? No, not as to method, but they can all subscribe to this—

> We reaffirm our conviction that the solution of the problem of disarmament and the organization of peace must finally be reached by an international agreement for universal disarmament and the total abolition of war. We reject the suggestion that war can be humanized. Therefore, we urge Governments to instruct their delegates to the Disarmament Conference to declare unequivocally that total disarmament is their goal.

At Geneva they balk and hesitate. A waiting world is weary of inaction. There is no progress without permanent peace. "World Disarmament or World Disaster!" Which? REIGH UTLEY.

Grenoble, France.

An Open Letter to Norman Thomas

It is about time for all good and serious minded citizens of this great republic of ours to be looking around for the man who is going to be the next president of these United States. Citizens who have the welfare of our country at heart must come out with suggestions as to what kind of a man they want and must express their opinions as to what sort of an individual he must be to drag our country out of the economic mire into which it has sunk.

I have no doubt but that many suggestions will be made. Some will say that our next president must be a great orator and statesman. Others will want a great merchant or business man. Still others will insist that he must be a practical scientist, an engineer for example. Of course, he will have to be a religious man, a man of great integrity, of good social and moral habits as well as many other minor virtues. Any or all of the above mentioned qualities will surely not exclude him on the ground of unfitness for the job. They might even be of help. However, as a citizen I beg to be permitted to suggest that our next president must be a man of plain speech and that above all else he must be well grounded in one simple mathematical fact; namely, that two plus two equals four. It cannot be less, it cannot be more. Not only must he know this, but he must also be willing to run on a platform containing but one plank. That plank will simply record the fact that two plus two equals four, nothing less, nothing more. Moreover, I say he must be just that kind of man. No other will do.

In order to secure the nomination for the presidency our candidate will have to summon to a meeting all of our financial geniuses and all our industrial giants, and he will have to address them thus:

"Gentlemen: I have summoned you here to obtain your support for my nomination and election to the presidency of the United States. For I well know that without your support I cannot secure the nomination, and even if I did secure it, without your support I cannot win the election. I wish to run for the presidency on a platform containing a single plank. That plank will simply state that two plus two equals four, nothing less, nothing more. I will show you how to run the affairs of our country most satisfactorily on that single plank.

"Up to the present moment you have been running the affairs of our country on 'The Philosophy of As If.' That is, you knew all along as well as I did that two plus two cannot equal more than four, but you conducted all the affairs as if two plus two might be made to equal more than four. Now, to paraphrase a sentence of one of the greatest living scientists of our age, nature is such that two plus two cannot be made to equal more than four by experimenting with any theory or philosophy, or by practicing any method whatsoever. It is the result of the practice of that philososophy that has sunk our country into the economic mire out of which you are trying in vain to extricate it.

"More than nineteen hundred years ago there lived a good and great man, Jesus of Nazareth. He was the greatest moral teacher of all time. He was the author of the Sermon on the Mount and the founder of the Christian religion. In addressing his audiences he was in the habit of exhorting those who would follow him to give up all their worldly possessions and their wealth. 'For,' said he, 'a rich man can no more hope to enter the kingdom of heaven than a camel can pass through the eye of a needle.' Now, we have adopted his religion, and ever since the adoption of that religion, we, both as individuals and as groups and nations, have had one chief preoccupation, namely, the acquisition by means fair or foul of as much wealth as possible. Indeed, it has come to such a pass that single individuals possess more than a billion, and our own nation owns nearly half the gold in the world. There are even those among you who say that we are slowly choking to death because of this glut of gold.

"Permit me, gentlemen, to digress here a moment to ask one question of my good friend, Mr. Henry Ford, who was kind and gracious enough to accept my

invitation to this meeting. What will you do, Mr. Ford, come Judgment Day, when the good St. Peter will ask you to push a camel through the eye of a needle before he will open for you the gates leading to the kingdom of heaven? What will you with your billions mocking your Christianity then do?

"But digressions aside, why did Jesus of Nazareth inveigh so vehemently against wealth? Surely wealth of and by itself cannot be a bad thing. A rich man can be a better Christian than a poor man. For example, he can give away dimes in church on Sundays. He can build colleges, libraries, hospitals and alms-houses. All these are good Christian practices. Why then did he inveigh so much against wealth? That, gentlemen, is because from his environment he sensed what was so tersely expressed more than eighteen hundred years later by a great Frenchman. In one of his books Victor Hugo wrote, 'colossal wealth has as its corollary colossal poverty.' A hundred years or more before Hugo an English bard sang,

> 'Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates and men decay.'

These men saw that not wealth was the real evil, but the accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few, with the consequent impoverishment of the many. Poverty is the real evil. So great is the evil, and so universally recognized, that our own good President, Mr. Hoover, promised in his preelection speeches that he would try to abolish poverty from our midst. And since Mr. Hoover assumed the presidency, poverty has been stalking like a pestilence throughout the length and breadth of our land. That is not because Mr. Hoover did not try. It is not because Mr. Hoover is a bad man. Indeed, he is a very good man. It is because Mr. Hoover, like yourselves, believes in the philosophy of As If. He still thinks that somehow or other two plus two can be made to equal more than four.

"About the middle of the last century there lived another great man, Karl Marx, of Germany. He wrote voluminous tomes. The sum and substance of all those volumes was to point out the fact that our whole economic system was being run, to its own destruction, on the theory that two plus two can be made to equal more than four. Karl Marx didn't put it in those words, but it amounts to precisely the same thing. He said, in brief, that the financiers and industrialists the world over put the people to work to produce the necessities and luxuries of life. They gave the people in the form of salaries and wages what was equivalent to only half of what they produced. They then expected these same people to be able to buy back the whole for the half. Here is the crux of the whole situation. It is equivalent to saying that you financiers and industrialists are running the affairs of the world on the theory that two plus two can be made to equal more than four. That can not be done. That is why you are bound to have industrial panics once every six or seven years. That is why you have over-production so-called. That is why you have underconsumption which is real. That is why people are starving to death while the granaries are overfilled to the bursting point. That is why people are neither clad nor shod while the industries producing those commodities are idle. That is why you are constantly plagued with the problem of unemployment and all its attendant miseries. That is why you have on the one hand colossal wealth and on the other colossal poverty. And think of it, gentlemen, all this can be abolished by abandoning the practice of the pernicious philosophy of As If, and by conducting all our affairs on the sound, natural law of mathematics that two plus two equals only four, nothing less, nothing more, the plank on which I wish to make my race for the presidency.

"Now after I shall have been nominated and duly elected to the presidency, with your help and support, I shall as my first step recommend to Congress to pass my first law. This law will deal with drastic reduction of incomes. Great concentration of wealth results from the fact that many of you have much more income than you can possibly spend. So we must put a limit to the maximum income. I shall recommend to Congress a hundred thousand per annum for the chief geniuses and giants, and correspondingly less for the others according to the greatness of the genius or the size of the giant. This income will be untaxable. You can do with it what you will. You can live in peace, comfort and happiness with your families, and raise good and useful American citizens for the future. Or you can buy yachts, play roulette, keep horses or actresses. No one shall say you nay. The chief good of this law will be that you will continue to conduct your affairs as usual. But all those millions in excess of one hundred thousand will be turned back to the nation, the source from which all those millions flowed. You can readily see that in this way wealth will not accumulate and men will not decay.

"Now every law passed must have a moral sanction as well as a logical background. So must this limitation of income law. Take the case of our friend, Mr. Henry Ford, as an example. Mr. Ford is both a genius and a giant. In fact he may be able to claim two incomes. One for being a genius, the other for being a giant. Some thirty years ago Mr. Ford was a poor man, so poor that no one would trust him a turkey for Christmas. Then Mr. Ford, by virtue of his genius, obtained a patent right to make and sell automobiles. That patent was a privilege conferred by the American people upon Mr. Ford. But the patent in itself would have been valueless to Mr. Ford had the American people been unwilling to continue spending untold millions annually to maintain our judiciary and our police forces in order to prevent anyone else from imitating Mr. Ford. Now then, since the American people must go to so much trouble and expense for the benefit of Mr. Ford, they have as a consequence both a moral and a logical right to limit his income to whatever maximum sum they see fit. And what has been said of Mr. Ford is equally true of every one of you. Your wealth depends upon privileges conferred and protection afforded by the people as a whole. Without such privilege and protection you could neither obtain nor retain your wealth.

"Now Mr. Ford may decide not to have so much income, knowing that it will be taken away from him. He may instead in his giant establishments employ four shifts of men six hours per day instead of three shifts eight hours per day. He may also decide to pay his men ten instead of seven dollars daily. That is just exactly what I should like him to do. And if all you financiers and industrialists will decide to do the same you will presently see your army of unemployed scatter like a flock of frightened fowl, and depression will vanish like snow before the April sun. Because by so

doing you will come nearer the sound mathematical fact that two plus two equals only four. The masses will be able to buy back much more of what they produce. You will not have so much underconsumption and therefore not so much overproduction. The tendency will disappear for the accumulation of colossal wealth and colossal poverty will disappear with it.

"Knowing human nature I feel that you will do those things voluntarily. For once you remove the incentive to excessive human greed, you at the same time remove human greed itself. But if you will not do it voluntarily, I will urge Congress to pass a statute whereby all industrial and other institutions doing interstate business shall adopt six hours per day as the legal working day. I know that the labor organizations of our country will see to it that the law is carried out.

"The late President Theodore Roosevelt said in one of his speeches, 'The tool-users must be made the tool-owners, and industry must be democratized.' That is an excellent idea and it can easily be put into effect. I shall recommend to Congress to pass a statute whereby all corporations doing interstate business shall set aside half of their stock issues and hold the same in trust for their workers. In this way the tool-users will be made at least half the tool-owners. As half-owners they will be entitled to half the representation on the board of directors. And so industry will become democratic. Here again you will readily concede the result. Wealth will not accumlate and men will not decay.

"I can hear the lawyers among you invoke the Constitution against me and the formula of 'due process of law.' All I can say in answer to that is that seventy years ago the Constitution was not invoked when the slaves were taken away from the slave-owners, and fourteen years ago the formula of due process of law was not invoked when the whiskey business and the brewery business were taken away from their respective giants. You must simply not invoke those things when a compelling emergency has arisen and when our beloved country must be saved.

"My next law will deal with inheritances. At your demise you will be permitted to leave to your wives and minors sufficient to keep the former in comfort for the rest of their lives and the latter until they shall have become of age. If any of your sons and daughters prove themselves to be geniuses and giants like yourselves, they may take your places. If not they will have to create a place for themselves, just as many of you have had to do and as the rest of the American sons and daughters must do. It goes without saying that this law will abolish the accumulation of colossal wealth, and colossal poverty will be abolished with it.

"I know that I shall have the enthusiastic backing of my friend Mr. Ford for the following law. This law will deal with the abolition of all stock exchanges as they exist today. Some years ago you bankers abolished horse-race gambling. You brought it about by the argument that because of that gambling your clerks pilfered sums of money from your coffers. You well know that those pilferings were like a widow's mite compared to the thefts perpetrated because of stock gambling. All kinds of injustices, crimes and even suicides are committed because of such gambling. It is unthinkable that geniuses of your caliber cannot devise a method whereby an honest man or a poor widow can invest his or her money in any financial or industrial establishment without the fear of gambling. I shall therefore have to devise a law that will eliminate stock exchanges and stock gambling forever. A clause in this law will limit the maximum dividend that may be paid by corporations. The practice of short selling will have to be abolished and the so-called stock dividends will have to be outlawed forever. Why, gentlemen, I know of one corporation in which a hundred shares grew by virtue of such stock dividends to the stupendous amount of twenty-two thousand five hundred shares. Now, if you could recall to life all the robber barons of old and all the usurers of the Middle Ages, and show them how in the course of a few years you can make a hundred ducats grow into twenty-two thousand five hundred ducats, they would grow so green with envy, would feel so ashamed of themselves for having been such picayune peanut-peddlers, that they would instantly drop dead and return to their graves. This law abolishing stock gambling will likewise tend to abolish ill-gained colossal wealth and ill-merited colossal poverty will be abolished with it.

"Some of you will contend that great enterprises cannot be conducted without stock exchanges, but I believe that the late Mr. Andrew Carnegie and Mr. Henry Ford have given an effective lie to that contention.

"I can hear you all cry out as if with one voice, 'But how can all those things be done in the face of that law on our statute books.' I am coming directly to that. That law was the invention, pardon me, I came near saying of the devil. That law was the invention of Mr. Sherman. It is known as the Sherman Law. It was intended to foster competition in trade. Innumerable blessings were supposed to flow from that law. Well, so many blessings flowed from the Sherman Law in our oil fields that two honest governors had to call out the militia to stop the flow. Many blessings likewise flowed into our coal fields. The conditions of the coal fields in West Virginia and elsewhere and of the men and women employed in them are a disgrace to any self-respecting, civilized, Christian nation. It is a stench in the nostrils of decent men. What has been said of coal and oil may be repeated for our wheat fields and our cotton fields. Our steel industry is declining and our railroads are in a bad way. They are all suffering from the excessive blessings that flow from that famous Sherman Law. I shall therefore remove that law from our statute-books. I shall not only prohibit, I shall even urge and encourage, great combinations of trade. I wager that President Daniel Willard, of the Baltimore and Ohio, could so unify and coordinate our fifty-eight railroad systems into one whole that he could employ his men six hours per day, pay them good American wages, pay the maximum dividend permitted by law, and still turn over a goodly sum into the treasury of the United States. I think our Mr. Thomas D. Campbell could organize the American farmers into million-acre units, and show them how to earn a fair American income without the intervention or the aid of any Farm Board. All our industry and our agriculture must be organized on a sane and scientific basis and conducted on the principle of two plus two equals four. In that way only will the harrowing poverty of our farmers be abolished. They will become great consumers of manufactured goods, and unemployment will become only a historic fact.

"I pointed out to you, gentlemen, that you gave the workers only half of what they produced, retaining

the other half for yourselves. Now there would not be much harm in that provided you could use the other half yourselves. If you could eat half the grain grown, wear half the clothing sewn, inhabit half the houses built, all might yet be well. But you can do no such thing. To obviate the difficulties arising from that inability on your part, you invented foreign trade. You all know how the great god of all modern nations both Christian and unchristian alike is foreign trade. Every nation is straining all its efforts to sell more than it buys. You have succeeded in that better than anyone else. In fact, you have succeeded so well that all the foreign nations owe you billions of dollars which they never can pay and never will pay. I shall, therefore, have to inaugurate for you a new system for foreign trade. In the phraseology of today, I'll tell the world! I'll tell our friends of the foreign nations that our people have abandoned the practice of the philosophy of As If. The blessings resulting from the abandonment of that practice have brought about a condition whereby our own people can consume nearly all the goods they produce. We, therefore, do not need and do not want much foreign trade. But we do need some of the things you produce, as well as you need some of the things we produce. So we shall by mutual agreement devise a sane and logical procedure whereby commodities may be exchanged to the benefit of all concerned. We shall sell to you anything we produce at the cost of production plus a fair and reasonable profit F. O. B. You can send your own ships for our goods if you choose. You on your part will have to agree to do the same for us. However, there will be certain restrictions which will be mutual. For example, we shall not attempt to sell coal to Newcastle, coffee to Brazil, or sugar to Cuba. You on your part will not attempt to sell wheat, oil, cotton or lumber to us. We already have more than we need. Not only shall we not permit you to sell them to us, we shall not even let you give them to us as a gift. It is very likely that our people will favor in their trade those countries which like our own shall have abandoned the childish philosophy of As If, so banal and disastrous in its results to humanity.

"As soon as that agreement shall have been signed by all the nations, there being no need for fighting ships, I shall instantly dispatch our entire naval fleet to Scapa Flow and ask our friends the British to use our ships for targent practice and sink them all. Why, gentlemen, I shall save for our country seven hundred millions per annum, enough to pay every giant and every genius in the land.

"In brief, gentlemen, my advice is that you take the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, add on to them what is good, practical, and feasible in the teachings of Karl Marx, and conduct your affairs accordingly. You will then be conducting them on the sound, natural law of mathematics that two plus two equals four, nothing less, nothing more.

"If you will follow my platform, you and yours and the nation as a whole will fare well, and good-will be unto all. If you do not, well I can only mention to you the repeated warnings of three men. These are neither inimical nor hostile to you. I mean William Green and Mathew Woll representing the masses of labor in our country, and Professor Nicholas Murray Butler. The latter in particular has called your attention to the challenge of Russian Communism. You must meet that challenge. You cannot long ignore it.

"In conclusion, gentlemen, let me say that I would like to hear from you before election day. Till then, good-bye, and I thank you."

I can assure my readers that at the conclusion of our candidate's speech, there will be a great clapping of hands and tossing of hats. Mr. Charles Schwab of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Mr. Mellon, and Mr. J. P. Morgan will run up to the platform, take the speaker on their shoulders and carry him around the hall amidst thunderous shouts and applause.

I. A. Husick, M. D.

Mahatma Gandhi's National College; The Gujarat Vidyapith

The criticism that has most often been made against the present system of education in schools and colleges in India is that it produces clerks and lower grade officers who are merely capable of recording or carrying out orders but are altogether incapable of initiative. If this so, it is indeed the greatest accusation that can be made against the system of education that prevails in India. An education that fails to make people capable of thinking and acting for themselves, and makes them into recording machines, is one which has not only ceased to fulfil its function, but what is worse, one which positively degenerates those who come under its influence. As against this, Gandhiji founded the national college which was to devote itself to the work of imparting higher education. The aim of this institution has been not merely to train students in University subjects, but what is more, to train them to be men and women of character devoted to the highest ideals, and capable of not only thinking and acting for themselves but also capable of guiding and directing those around them who have not had similar opportunities of education.

A visitor who spends a few days at the *Vidyapith* discovers before long the high idealism of the staff and students. It is not that cheap sentimentalism which is put on for effect and parade on suitable occasions, and which in times of testing is found wanting. In fact no one at the Vidyapith speaks about his ideals; nevertheless one knows that one is in the midst of men of high character and devotion to duty. When negotiations between Gandhiji and the Viceroy failed and the Civil Disobedience Movement was again to be continued, the students knew full well what hardship and suffering it was going to mean for them, for they had taken part in the last campaign and most of them had been in prison and put in the lowest class. There was great joy and happiness among them at the thought of serving the villages and the country, and they regarded the sacrifice and suffering which it would involve on their part as of no account. When asked whether they liked to leave their studies and go out for political work in the villages, or to continue at the *Vidyapith,* all of them without exception replied that they had no likes or dislikes in the matter. They would gladly do whatever the authorities thought it best for them to do. One of them, eighteen years of age, told me, "Our duty is to perish that others may live. We must root out all personal likes and dislikes and do our

duty without respect to consequences for ourselves." When he said this I knew from where he got his inspiration. It was from the Bhagavad Gita which urged the performance of duty irrespective of pleasure or pain to oneself, and which was read and recited every morning and evening at the *Vidyapith*.

When it was decided that the students should go out into the villages for political work, they all left cheerfully in twos and threes, with only a change of clothes and a blanket. They were to receive food from whoever gave it to them and sleep where they could. They were to wander from village to village. They were left entirely to their own resources regarding the work they were to do. Each student was to organize what work he could and to go wherever he thought necessary within the district that was allotted to him. The students knew the hard trudge, the coarse food, the poor beds, the solitude and weariness of their task, the responsibility of doing things on their own initiative, and the beating and imprisonment that were awaiting them. They were sure that this time they would receive much severer treatment at the hands of the police than last time, and yet they could not have been happier as they left for their various destinations. I thought to myself that if Gandhiji had done nothing more than to have founded an institution such as this which could train its students to such a high conception of duty, he deserved for ever the gratitude of the nation. Young men of such sterling character are an asset to any country, and no country which can produce such young men can for long remain in bondage.

It is often thought that because the *Vidyapith* sends out students for political work in times of "war," its interest is chiefly political. This is far from the truth. If the *Vidyapith* sends out its students in times of "war," it is only what every college in any part of the world does with its students in similar circumstances. Its main work is as little political as the work of any other school or college. It spends a great deal of time and money on pure research, although if there is any one criticism that may be leveled against it, it is that it tends to be almost entirely practical in its emphasis. This may be out of reaction from the ordinary schools and colleges which are so divorced from realities that many of those who pass out of them are practically useless to the communities to which they belong. The education they have received is a purely theoretical one which has left very little impress on their practical life, with the result that it has not affected their community or village. As against this, the education that is now given at the *Vidyapith* is intensely practical. The student is trained to be a leader in his own village, and hence he is given instruction not only in subjects such as Vernacular Literature, Sanskrit, Music, Mathematics, History, Geography and such like, but also in Carpentry, Carding, Spinning and Weaving, and Rural Economics. The latter class of subjects receives greater emphasis than the former, and when the country is in dire need of educated men for work in the villages, who will say that the *Vidyapith* is not fulfilling its responsibility as a national educational institution?

The very fact that the Government has now closed the *Vidyapith* and taken possession of its buildings and property is sufficient witness to the fact that the *Vidyapith* is a live institution, too much alive as a matter of fact to suit the Government. If other educational institutions in India had even a fraction of the idealism and practical sense that pervades the staff and students of the *Vidyapith*, India would win self-government in a day, and what is more, would be able to build for herself in a short time a future worthy of her past.

BHARATAN KUMARAPPA.

Ahmedabad, India.

The Torch

(*A Dialogue Between Disciple and Master*)

"Master, when I study in our Law,
Joy sustains me every hour.
Master, when my thoughts from thee withdraw,
Sorrow chains me in its power.

"When two travelers must say farewells,
Where the forest pathways meet,
He who bears a torch in safety dwells;
Darkness shrouds his comrade's feet.

"Every man must bear the torch he lights,
Pitting flame against his fear,
Lest his soul grope blindly for the heights
In this wilderness of tears."

(RABBI) LOUIS I. NEWMAN.

Roman Memories

Tivoli

Within this verdant bowl, fed by cool crystal streams,
Phoebus might strike his lyre—Pan pipe his reeden lute—
Mindful of Tempe's Vale! while Luna's limpid beams
Laved the fair limbs of Aphrodite's train;
And stirred to life the dreamy trees, long mute,
Till Daphne's timid ghost might wake again
Glad to receive her lover-god's embrace
From which she trembling fled in virgin haste.

Haunted by memories of a long-lost road
Far from the silly world of modern fools,
To slake their thirst at these refreshing pools,
Two mortals here might make their meet abode;
And find again the secret of arcadian bliss
Needing no paradise more Eden-like than this!

LILLIAN BROWNE-OLF.

The Truth Promethean

"Man is born free": is he not then born true?
Free in the Truth wherein all Freedom dwells?
And hath not Truth her mountain citadels
Beyond those walls that Mammon overthrew?
And are not we, who from our fastness view
The host encompassing, like him who tells
Of his lost Heaven as ten thousand Hells
In having lost the Truth that once we knew?

I will set free the Truth: my sword shall cleave
Through helm and hauberk to the heart of lies;
I will break up their citadels and leave
A highway for the Truth, that out of man
Freed from his Golden Images may rise
The living Truth—the Truth Promethean.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

You're Fired

Along the factory fence, the people lined,
Upon whose bodies hunger left a mark
As lightning when it splints the moulding bark
Of mammoth trees. Their hope was but to find
A job;—but I have seen them droop in sorrow
When they were told no labor was required
Today, and no one need return tomorrow;
While times were dull no workers would be hired!

Inside the mill, the mighty motors twirled,
And speed was lifted to its highest pitch.
The hourly slaves, who were disgusted, hurled
Defiance at the robots and the rich.
The slaves were timed, and feared to rest, though tired
They knew the hellish meaning in—"You're fired!"

MELVILLE KRESS.

The Study Table

Did Jesus Make Mistakes?

Robert G. Ingersoll, in a famous lecture, pointed out the mistakes of Moses. William Floyd, in a new book* approved by the Free Thought Book Club, points out the mistakes of Jesus. Mr. Floyd has not the eloquence of Ingersoll, but he has the Bible facts, and makes calm, quiet, but effective use of them.

Indeed, the "Mistakes of Jesus" is devastating—at least for Fundamentalists! One wonders what possible answer they could offer to the evidence presented in these pages. What the author does is to accept the doctrine of Biblical infallibility seriously, for what it means if it may be assumed to mean anything. He takes the Fundamentalists at their word, that everything in the scriptures is literally true just as it stands, and then applies the remorseless tests of experience, common-sense, and modern scientific knowledge. He does not even spare the ethical test, but presents the challenge that Jesus, as recorded in the text of the New Testament, not only taught antiquated theology, gave false impressions, was guilty of errors of fact and judgment, fell into confusions and contradictions, but also failed on occasion to measure up to the highest ideals of thought and conduct. He was in many ways, says Mr. Floyd, "an inferior prototype." We repeat that we can't imagine what the Fundamentalists would answer to these charges. The author quotes chapter and verse of an infallible text, with appropriate comment, and asks for reply. But of course Fundamentalists don't make reply. That is one of the delights of faith. One may believe, as old Tertullian cried in a dilemma of this kind, "Just because it is unbelievable."

But if the "Mistakes of Jesus" is as fatal to Fundamentalism as machine-gun fire to a herded mob, it is less effective as directed against Modernists and liberals generally. This perhaps is an unfair contention, for it is the first duty of a reviewer to accept and judge a book from its own standpoint, and this volume, as we have said, is aimed straight and sure at an inspired Christianity as sprung from an infallible Bible. But Mr. Floyd now and again refers to Modernists, and raises question as to any acceptance of Jesus as a trusted leader. "His authority is gone," he says. Which gives us opportunity at least to point out the position of the historical critic.

First of all, this critic, and liberals generally, have long since thrown overboard the doctrine of inerrant scriptures. They accept the Old and New Testaments not as divine revelation at all, but as literature produced as any other literature is produced by fallible even though poetically inspired men. They take it for granted that the Bible is full of errors and contradictions and contemporary superstitions. They are not surprised, therefore, at what Mr. Floyd has discovered. Indeed, they would be surprised if he found anything else.

Again, since the Bible is regarded by liberal believers and scientific students as not a single piece of revelation and that infallible, they are able to make distinction between different books of the Bible, and between different chapters and passages in these books. Thus, the modern reader of the Scriptures separates the Gospel of "John" from the three Synoptic Gospels, and accepts the latter and not the former as an historical source. "John," from the literary and spiritual point of view, is one of the immortal religious documents of all time. But it was written anywhere from two to three generations after the death of Jesus, and with the deliberate purpose of theological interpretation and not of historical record. Nothing that is set down in these pages, therefore, can be regarded as sound, so far as factual evidence is concerned. When, therefore, Mr. Floyd quotes numerous statements of the Nazarene from the Johannine Gospel, and describes them as "mistakes," the liberal remains undisturbed. He simply explains that Jesus never said them.

Then, as regards the Synoptics, there is the perpetual question as to whether the material in "Matthew," "Mark," and "Luke" reflects the minds of the authors (known or unknown), or the mind of Jesus. Only one of these Gospels, be it noted, is attributed to a disciple, and that attribution is utterly discredited. The three Synoptics were written at second or even third hand; and thus, in an age when there were no newspapers and written documents were scarce, far removed from the Nazarene himself. What we have in these Gospels is story, or rumor, passed on year after year from mouth to mouth, and at last, all too late, set down in writing. To what extent, under these conditions, can we be sure of what the record tells us? Mr. Floyd makes an impressive point in the matter of Jesus's claim to be the Jewish Messiah. But did Jesus claim this, or did his disciples *think* he claimed it? He shrewdly and effectively emphasizes Jesus's prodigious "mistake" in proclaiming the approaching end of the world. But was this Jesus's conviction, or the disciples' expectation? It is to be said, on Mr. Floyd's behalf, that there is plenty of first-class authority for his assumption that these are the errors of the Nazarene. But we cannot be sure!

Again, there is the fact, implicit in the whole liberal point of view, that Jesus, like any other historical figure, was a man of his time. Of course from the Fundamentalist standpoint, he was a man of all time, and should have known everything, and known it rightly. But the liberal, or the Modernist, for that matter, sees Jesus as the citizen of an obscure country in a remote age. Inevitably this man shared the ideas of his place and period; and it is not his fault, no sign of his foolishness, no evidence of "mistakes" as such, if many of these ideas are now known to have been superstitions. Plato and Aristotle show up relatively no better in this matter than Jesus, but we think none the less of them on this account.

Lastly, since Jesus was a man, and not a deity, the modern thinker expects of course to find him fallible, just as he expects to find the Bible fallible. Since he has this expectation, he is not disappointed, nor even surprised, when he discovers that Jesus made the "mistakes" which are characteristic of human nature. But this does not invalidate Jesus's authority, nor diminish his spiritual stature. As well dethrone Sir Isaac Newton because he worked out a false theory of light, or dismiss the genius of Goethe because he was susceptible to women, or question the moral leadership of Washington because he was a slave-holder!

*"The Mistakes of Jesus," by William Floyd. Published by the Freethought Press Association, New York.

The marvel of Jesus is the splendor of his spirit shining within the still imperfect lantern of the flesh. Jesus was only a man—but *what a man!*

What Mr. Floyd has done is to produce a *reductio ad absurdum* of the orthodox Christology. He has done a complete job. He has left our Fundamentalist friends not a leg to stand on. Also, showing how ridiculous is the traditional claim for Jesus's infallibility and perfectness as implicit in his alleged divinity, he has disclosed how poor a service the church has done the Nazarene by thus presenting him in garments not his own. These trappings of dogma our author has now stripped away, and thus revealed the essential man. *"Ecce homo!"* This is Jesus—not the Second Person of the Trinity, but the carpenter of Nazareth, human, fallible, imperfect, yet still the greatest spiritual genius of history.

". . . take him for all in all,
(We) shall not look upon his like again."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Correspondence

An Answer to Mrs. Auxter

Editor of UNITY:

In the May 9th issue of UNITY there appears a letter by Naomi B. Auxter of Kalamazoo, Michigan, that criticizes an editorial by Clarence R. Skinner on "Motives to Work in a New Social Order." My good friend Herbert S. Bigelow and I read UNITY together, my wife being secretary of the People's Church of which he is pastor. He may have clipped Skinner's article before I read it, but it is the false premise concerning the cause of the present unemployment that is put forward by friend Auxter that I must comment upon, and not upon the original article.

The statement is made that: "the system produces a surplus of commodities over and above what the people who produced the articles can buy back." If by this is meant that the active factors such as labor, management, etc., do not get all the income to divide among them, then this is true, yet not only capitalists but the members of all the voluntary co-operative societies countenance payments to passive factors, such as bondholders and shareholders. If these payments are counted in it is inescapable that the total income in money will buy the total commodities produced, unless one of two things happen. The first is that some of the purchasing power is unused. When there was only currency money created by governments such hoarding could be serious if suddenly indulged in by large numbers of people, because the money hoarded formed a large fraction of the total. Hoarding has not been a serious problem for almost one hundred years in spite of the recent ballyhoo about it.

The other thing that can happen to purchasing power is that it can be destroyed. This happens when banks "call" loans. Our friend should read Withers, a conservative, Keynes, a liberal, or Soddy, a radical, on the mechanics of money to understand how banks can legally create ten times as much money as there is currency and that when they uncreate it we have unemployment because it takes bankruptcy, hunger, and time to reduce prices to the new volume of money.

Karl Marx thought capitalists saved first and then invested; that was because he got his economics out of other men's books. What actually happens is that investment is made first, by banks lending money they legally can create, then we have a boom. When capitalists pay off loans out of profits, landlords pay off mortgages out of rents, and workingmen pay installment notes out of wages, then much purchasing power is destroyed and a depression occurs, unless an equal amount of new loans comes into being to balance the money destroyed.

Capitalism can achieve this balance very easily within any country which is economically self-sufficient such as the United States, or any consortium of countries can do it such as the British Empire. Capitalism can easily adjust so that all produced is consumed but there will still remain the question: shall the right of each to consume or control consumption rest on effort or ownership?

WALTER J. MILLARD.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

In Praise of Dr. Strong

Editor of UNITY:

I am writing to thank you for Dr. Strong's article on "Saving the Anglo-Saxon," which stirred me to the very depths of my being. It sounds like one of the prophets of old. It has comforted me by showing me that there is still sincerity and moral courage in Israel. I am also much indebted to Dr. Holmes for his article, "Is America Christian?" I am happy in being one of UNITY's subscribers, in whose pages I meet so many noble spirits.

EMMA A. CYRUS.

Quincy, Illinois.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 242)

truth and in reprehensible violation of the very sanctities of life. Such, at its worst, is the blatant ballyhoo for booze.

In the third place, there is a determined effort to make it appear that prohibition was foisted upon the country by a bigoted minority, by which it has been maintained, and that the public as a whole would repudiate it if given the chance. Hence the various devices, including that of the straw vote, inaugurated for the purpose of demonstrating that the majority of the people of the United States are against prohibition. Leading this division of the Ballyhoo is the *Literary Digest,* and since the latter is now functioning at the peak of production, we offer a few considerations which we deem timely and pertinent.

To begin with, we believe the device of the straw vote as applied by the *Digest* to questions of constitutional government, to be questionable in principle. It is not a question here of seeking to anticipate the outcome of a regular election, as in the case of a presidential campaign. In this case, there is a well defined constitutional procedure for arriving at the public will. In this and similar straw votes, we have a private organization, on its own initiative and according to its own whim or motive, seeking to take the short cut athwart this procedure and pretending to register accurately popular opinion. As a mere matter of journalistic enterprise, one such vote might be viewed with a comparative indulgence. The fact, however, that a succession of straw votes on prohibition seems to have become a part of the policy of the *Digest,* indicates that there may be behind the whole scheme the shrewd purpose of forcing the issue and dragging it out of its proper, constitutional channels. Whatever the motive, it is an attempt to prejudge the voice of the American people in the submission of certain questions imposed upon them without permitting them any chance to decide the form or text of the questions submitted. As such it assumes a semi-official function which implies a presumption that approaches effrontery.

Granting, however, the good faith and the good order of the procedure, there are several reasons, of which we can take space here to mention but two or three, why the *Digest* poll is not and cannot be the accurate gauge of opinion which is claimed for it. Obviously, whether by "malice aforethought" or not, the poll is a big feature of the wet ballyhoo, and is eagerly entered by the enemies of prohibition. The wets who receive ballots vote early and often—as often as they can get duplicate ballots. The drys, on the other hand, are lukewarm on the straw vote, many refraining to participate on principle, while others, feeling that there is nothing to gain, do not return their ballots. Thus, of the twenty million votes mailed out in 1930, but approximately five million were returned. From the result of the election which followed, which showed the result of the poll to have meant almost nothing, it was evident that the wets had participated in the

straw vote far out of proportion to the drys. Furthermore, the *Digest's* indignant protests to the contrary notwithstanding, it seems rather clear that the preponderant vote of the poll is registered in the large city areas which are admittedly the wet strongholds. On the whole, the heavy majorities against prohibition as reported from week to week, which are garnered chiefly from the cities, prove too much! The wet ballyhoo o'erleaps itself.

But what of the *Digest's* claim that its various polls have been strikingly accurate as demonstrated by succeeding elections? This claim cannot be substantiated except in the case of those straw votes which sought to measure the strength of opposing parties, in which the situation is quite simple and altogether different from a poll on the prohibition issue. On the latter question, it has failed entirely to gauge popular opinion as later registered in the vote for candidates. In its poll in the Spring of 1930, approximately seventy percent of the participants favored repeal or modification of the Eighteenth Amendment. Six months later came the election of a new House of Representatives, in which the wets secured but one-third of the members. The widely-heralded straw vote was almost directly reversed. In reply, it may be urged that in the election other considerations than that of prohibition entered into the result. We grant it, and to get a more accurate measure, we turn to some of the primary elections in which the contests were not between opposing parties but between candidates of the same party, some running as wet and others as dry. Take Pennsylvania for example, the vote in whose primary election was given the following analysis by the Economic Research Service of the American Business Men's Prohibition Foundation:

"In the Keystone State, with the wet and dry issue uppermost and dominant in the public mind, the two Anti-Prohibition candidates in the Republican primary, one for Governor and one for Senator, were both openly and ardently backed by the money and propaganda of the National Association Against the Prohibition Amendment. These Anti-Prohibition candidates standing on an out and out 'repeal' platform, polled respectively just 20 and 23½ per cent of the vote actually cast. The opposing candidates, running on 'bone dry' and 'mild dry' platforms received the rest, 80 per cent, in the case of the Governor, and 76½ per cent in the case of the United States Senatorial vote. But the *Literary Digest* Poll gave the Pennsylvania percentages as 46 per cent 'wet,' 26 per cent 'moist,' and 28 per cent 'dry.' "

The vote in Pennsylvania was of special significance, not only because the *Digest* poll had shown it to be heavily wet but also because almost one-third of the straw votes had come from Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts. So much for the boasted accuracy of the *Digest* polls in registering public opinion on the prohibition question. In this connection we cannot forbear recalling an incident of the aforementioned 1930 poll, as reported in *The Christian Century* by its Washington correspondent. According to figures published in the *Digest*, 42 ministers of the National Capital voted for enforcement, 38 for modification, and 234 for repeal. So astounded were the local pastors that they immediately called the roll themselves to ascertain the facts. Of the 195 ministers from whom they heard, 182 voted for enforcement, six for modification, and none for repeal. It was learned that 107 of these had received a ballot card and 84 had returned it with a vote for enforcement. "Where the scandalous figures reported came from," said the correspondent, who was one of the leading ministers of Washington, "remains a deep and dark mystery."

We have given the *Digest* poll more attention than it deserves, except for the fact that it looms so large in the public mind just now. If the ballyhoo carried on under such respectable and dignified auspices is seen to be so vulnerable and misleading, what may not be said for the rest of it?

In reality, the issues which the wets have forced upon us have become even bigger than that of prohibition as a national policy, even bigger than the more inclusive problem of what shall be done about liquor, even bigger than the question of law enforcement. They are indicated in such questions as these:

Shall the metropolitan centers be allowed to dominate the thought and conduct of the United States?

Is there any recourse from a mercenary and malicious wet press which prostitutes its news columns and poisons the fountains of public information?

Is our experiment in republican government to fail and is constitutional government to be overthrown through the anarchy of imperious self-will?

Shall the beneficent movement for social control be stopped at the barrier of personal thirst?

From such leading questions as these, it is clear that to yield to the wet ballyhoo would be to lose more than the most effective control of the nefarious liquor traffic that has yet been worked out. No restrictive law was ever devised that the liquor forces could be made to obey. It was they themselves who forced the public in self-defense to put the Eighteenth Amendment into the Constitution. It is entirely fitting that in their frantic attempts to break down prohibition, the violent champions of booze should use methods as conscienceless and lawless as the liquor traffic has always proved itself to be. To yield to their captious clamor would be to surrender cravenly to the enemies of civilized society and social progress. In the memorable words of defiance to the liquor forces spoken by President Bryan of Indiana University: "We are not going back into the jungle. We are going to march straight on."

—*The American Friend.*

TO UNITY READERS

Greetings from a like minded person who has a delightful country place on the East shore of Lake Michigan which she would like to share with you.

One hundred or more people can be accommodated—an ideal spot for group conferences on social questions.

If interested write—

ERMINA MOORE

Syringa Bluff South Haven, Mich.

Just Out

A Charming Gift Book

THE HEART OF SCOTT'S POETRY

A Selection of the Best Poetry

of Sir Walter Scott

With a Critical Introduction,

By

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

This beautiful volume was prepared and published in recognition of the Scott Centenary (1832-1932)

Price $2.50

Order of your bookseller or of the publishers

Oxford University Press

114 Fifth Avenue New York City